UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,555	05/26/2006	Reinhold Eichhorn	02894-728US1 06609-PT2/co	6680

26161 7590 10/23/2009

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
LEE, LAURA MICHELLE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3724	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/552,555	EICHHORN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LAURA M. LEE	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3, 5-7, 11, 13, 14,16,17,20-22, 25-29* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2, 4,8 9, 10,12,15,11,19,23, 24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The amendments to the specification were received on 6/16/2009. The drawings received on 10/12/2005 are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4,8, 9,10,12, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (U.S. Patent 7,150,285), herein referred to as Saito in view of Otsuka et al. (U.S. Patent 5,189,792), herein referred to as Otsuka.

Saito discloses an electric shaver system comprising:

a shaver (10; Figures 4/5) having: a shaving head (12); and electrical motor (not shown) mechanically connected to the shaving head; and a battery (15) electrically connected to the motor;

and a shaver cleaner (Figure 6) configured to hold a quantity of cleaning fluid (cleaning liquid) and defining a trough-shaped receptacle (basin, 50) configured to receive the shaving head of the shaver therein (Figure 2);

wherein the shaver (10) includes a first connector (pads, 13/ receiving terminal 11) that couples with an associated connecter (transmitting terminal, 91; Figure 6) of the shaver cleaner to transmit electrical or electromagnetic energy between the shaver cleaner and the shaver.

Although it appears that Saito discloses wherein the shaver includes an additional connector, spaced apart from the first connector and configured to connect the battery to an auxiliary power source, a connector is not positively disclosed. As shown in Figure 1, the bottom of the shaver shows a square opening, which the approximate size and shape and location of known electrical connectors, however, as the Saito does not comment on this feature it would be speculative to assume that that feature is an electrical connector. However, it is old and well known in the art to utilize an electrical connector to directly attach the shaving unit to a power source. Attention is further directed to the Otsuka shaver which also discloses a motorized shaver that utilizes a battery power source. Otsuka discloses providing charge terminals 96, in the bottom of the shaver, as similarly (arguably) shown by Saito in order to recharge the batteries through a connection to a charger. It simiallry would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided a connector on the bottom of the Saito shaver as shown by Otsuka so that the shaver could be charged directly without the use of the cleaner apparatus.

It is also noted that as the function and position of the charge terminal as shown by Otsuka was old and well known in the art, that the combination of two terminals on a singular apparatus (both in known positions) would have obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

The modified device of Saito discloses wherein the additional connector (96) is an electrical plug-type connection.

Response to Arguments

4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Applicant argues that the examiner has improperly used hindsight reasoning to combine the Saito and Otsuka references to show the combination of a single electric shaver with two electrical connection ports. However, an electrical connection in cooperation with a cleaning device is shown by Saito to be known in the art and an electrical connection in cooperation with a charger is shown by Otsuka is shown to be known in the art. Applicant has combined two known features in the art into a single embodiment with to arrive at a predictable outcome of being to charge the batteries of the razor without needing the cleaning device and has provided this possibility by

utilizing two discrete electrical ports. The use of multiple electrical connections is old and well known in the art, for instance look to portable DVD players, cell phones, home phones, IPODS which all utilize a wide range of connections to be employed with a variety of locations. For instance DVD players and cell phones can use car adaptors with use with cigarette lighters, yet also different adaptors and ports for use in the home. IPODS are also connectable to base stereo units and the home computer to charge their batteries. Home phones are utilized with a variety of bases to be used with or without an answering machine or other device. There are many arts which have incorporated multiple adaptors/ ports for a variety of electrical applications. The combination of taking two known electrical connections and employing them on a single apparatus is well established with the predictable outcome of being able to use the razor battery charger with a multiple of charging bases.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA M. LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-8339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laura M Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 3724
10/13/2009
/Boyer D. Ashley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724